



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

|                                                                                                                                                               |             |                       |                           |                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.                                                                                                                                               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/709,791                                                                                                                                                    | 05/28/2004  | Sreekumar K. SESHADRI | ORCL-004/OID-2003-265-01  | 3790             |
| 51121 7590 04/19/2007<br>LAW FIRM OF NAREN THAPPETA<br>158, PHASE ONE PALM MEADOWS, RAMAGUNDANAHALLI<br>AIRPORT WHITEFIELD ROAD<br>BANGALORE, 560043<br>INDIA |             |                       | EXAMINER<br>WATT, CHRIS A |                  |
|                                                                                                                                                               |             |                       | ART UNIT                  | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                                                                                                                                               |             |                       | 2174                      |                  |

|                                        |            |               |
|----------------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
| 3 MONTHS                               | 04/19/2007 | PAPER         |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/709,791

Applicant(s)

SESHADRI, SREEKUMAR K.

Examiner

Chris Watt

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said second experience profile" in lines 8 and 12.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claim does cite a "second experience file," earlier in the claim, and the examiner has read this to mean "second experience profile" for purposes of this action. However, timely correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craycroft et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149629) in view of Novak et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101444) and Buxton et al (US Patent No. 6,469,714).

Regarding independent claim 1, Craycroft teaches a method of enabling a user to have a custom desired experience while accessing electronic files using an application, said method comprising: providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of

Art Unit: 2174

Craycroft; also compare "Look and Feel" of desktop in FIGS. 2D and 2E et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile being provided external to said first electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C control files such as "untitled 2" in FIGS. 2A and 2B et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile containing a first set of values for a first set of experience attributes; controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to said first electronic file using said application (i.e. Font, Icon and List views in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with a second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into Craycroft to create a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Buxton teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file (i.e. step 606 in FIG. 6 et seq. of Buxton). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a second file of Buxton into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Buxton into the modified Craycroft to give a greater degree of control over

Art Unit: 2174

the interface through file and application interaction (i.e. see col. 2 line 44 et seq. of Buxton).

Regarding dependent claim 2, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: providing said user the ability to specify said first experience profile associated with a third electronic file; and controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to said third electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 3, see the analysis of claim 2 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising changing said first experience profile to change the experience while accessing each of said first electronic file and said third electronic file, but not said second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 4, see the analysis of claim 3 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 3, wherein said first set of values is not the same as said second set of values and wherein said first set of experience attributes is not the same as said second set of experience attributes (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 5, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving an input to open said first electronic file; providing access to said first electronic file while controlling said first of experience attributes according to said first set of values (i.e. steps 1202-1204 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 6, see the analysis of claim 5 above. Craycroft in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said first of experience attributes comprises a shape of a cursor (i.e. [0034] et seq. of Craycroft: "control the appearance of ... cursors").

Regarding dependent claim 7, see the analysis of claim 5 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said first electronic file comprises a document which can be edited and wherein said first set of experience attributes comprises a music file, said method further comprising playing music represented by said music file while providing access to said document (i.e. compare song list in Fig. 14 with Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 8, see the analysis of claim 5 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said application is executed on a system supported by an operating system, wherein said application and said operating system respectively support an application default and an operating system default, wherein said first set of values override said application



Art Unit: 2174

default and said operating system default if in conflict (i.e. "Apple Default" in FIG. 11 et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 9, see the analysis of claim 5 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said providing comprises: indicating a plurality of experience profiles available for association with electronic files, wherein said plurality of experience profiles comprising said first experience profile and said second experience profile; and receiving a selection from said user, wherein said selection indicates that said first experience profile is to be associated with said first electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding independent claim 10, Craycroft teaches a method of enabling a user to have a custom desired experience while accessing a first electronic file using a first application, said method comprising: enabling said user to specify an experience attribute associated with said first application and a value for said experience attribute (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with a second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated

Art Unit: 2174

to combine Novak into Craycroft to create a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Buxton teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file (i.e. step 606 in FIG. 6 et seq. of Buxton). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a second file of Buxton into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Buxton into the modified Craycroft to give a greater degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction (i.e. see col. 2 line 44 et seq. of Buxton).

Regarding dependent claim 11, see the analysis of claim 10 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 10, said first application comprises a word processing application and said first electronic file comprises a editable file (i.e. "Memo" in FIG. 3A et seq. of Buxton), and wherein said second application is designed to play a song from a file, and said value comprises an identifier of said file (i.e. songs in Fig. 14 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 12, see the analysis of claim 11 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 11, wherein said user can specify a second experience attribute associated with first electronic file, wherein said second experience attribute controls a volume of said song (i.e. compare song list and volume control in Fig. 14 with Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).



Regarding dependent claim 13, see the analysis of claim 12 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said first experience attribute and said second experience attribute are specified in an experience profile associated with said first electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding independent claim 14, Craycroft teaches a computer readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions causing a digital processing system to enable a user to have a custom desired experience while accessing electronic files using an application, wherein execution of said one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors contained in said digital processing system causes said one or more processors to perform the actions of: providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile being provided external to said first electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C control files such as "untitled 2" in FIGS. 2A and 2B et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile containing a first set of values for a first set of experience attributes; controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to said first electronic file using said application (i.e. Font, Icon and List views in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and controlling a second electronic file (i.e. "related files for a skin" in step 1200 of Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into Craycroft to create a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Buxton teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file (i.e. step 606 in FIG. 6 et seq. of Buxton). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a second file of Buxton into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Buxton into the modified Craycroft to give a greater degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction (i.e. see col. 2 line 44 et seq. of Buxton).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 2, differing primarily in that claim 15 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 2 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 3, differing primarily in that claim 16 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 3 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 4, differing primarily in that claim 17 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 4 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 5, differing primarily in that claim 18 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 5 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 6, differing primarily in that claim 19 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 6 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 7, differing primarily in that claim 20 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 7 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 8, differing primarily in that claim 21 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 8 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 9, differing primarily in that claim 22 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 9 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Regarding independent claim 23, Craycroft teaches a computer readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions causing a digital processing system to enable a user to have a custom desired experience while accessing a first electronic file using a first application, said computer readable medium comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

enabling said user to specify an experience attribute associated with said first application and a value for said experience attribute (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with a second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into the modified Craycroft to create a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Buxton teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file (i.e. step 606 in FIG. 6 et seq. of Buxton). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a second file of Buxton into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Buxton into Craycroft to give a greater degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction (i.e. see col. 2 line 44 et seq. of Buxton).

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 11, differing primarily in that claim 24 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 11 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 12, differing primarily in that claim 25 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 12 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 13, differing primarily in that claim 26 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 13 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Watt whose telephone number is (571) 270-1046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-4:00 Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris A. Watt/

April 12, 2007

CAW

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100